



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/189,043	11/09/1998	SCOTT M. ROCKLAGE	238/117	5059
21834	7590 11/02/2005		EXAMINER	
BECK AND TYSVER P.L.L.C. 2900 THOMAS AVENUE SOUTH			HARTLEY, MICHAEL G	
SUITE 100 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55416			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1618	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/189,043	ROCKLAGE ET AL.
Examiner-initiated litterview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael G. Hartley	1618
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Michael G. Hartley</u> .	(3)	
(2) Mark Litman (App. repr.).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 31 October 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applica Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed: none		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
mtadhta		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Litman to inform him that the amendment to the specification directed to "related applications data" (continuing data) filed 3/7/2005 was improper since it attempted to claim a later filed application, for example, 09/322,042 as a continuation-in-part, and a later filed application cannot be any type of continuing case. it was agreed upon to cancel the "related application data" of 3/7/2005 and use the continuing data of the amendment filed 11/9/1998 which is correct.